

THE NEW REPUBLIC.

VOL. 1,

CLEVELAND, AUGUST 2, 1862.

NO. 10.

The Compromises of the Constitution.

A Discourse delivered at Rev. M. D. Conway's Church, in Cincinnati, on the evening of the 4th of May, 1862.

BY ORSON S. MURRAY.

He who inaugurated American Independence, and did more than any other for its achievement—who “initiated” a revolution that has never yet been completed—said of those eventful times—those dark days in which he and his worthy compatriots struggled and agonized—“these are times that try men’s souls.” Of the present trying times, it may with propriety be said—these are times that try this Nation, to know whether or not it is composed of stuff worth saving—of men and women who have self-respect, self-reliance and virtue, equal to self-salvation—faith in human powers and human destiny, that will enable them to rise out of this ignominious humiliation.

Compromise has been our ruin. To re-enact compromise is to re-enact ruin. To re-establish causes is to reproduce consequences.

If a different statement of the case, in words, be preferred, let it be, that *adherence to Constitutional compromise* has been our ruin:—that pertinacious adherence to the parchment, with the literal original engrossment, holding it unaltered and unalterable—unamended and unamendable—has poured us out these seas of blood, and spread us this desolation over the land. Whether you prefer this statement or that, the conclusion is the same, and is inevitable—that the return and re-establishment of the causes will be the reproduction of the consequences.

The majority are prepared to say, *no more compromise*. This alone is sufficiently significant of conviction that the compromises of the Constitution have been of ruinous tendency and effect. To say *no more compromise*, then, is not enough to say. Nothing will be salutary short of saying, *no return*

to compromise. The experience already had with it should suffice. Once to have traveled over that dark and bloody ground, should be quite enough. It has become a very general sentiment in the North that going *forward* into compromise would be pernicious and unjustifiable. To go *backward* into compromise would certainly be more pernicious and more unjustifiable.

A leading Western writer, under the head—“What shall the Final Settlement be?—The Pacification”—declares that “compromise is a sublime humbug.” As pertaining to the United States Constitution and Government, it is all this and much more and worse. The language is not sufficiently serious and otherwise significant for the occasion. Well would it be comparatively, for the people of the United States to-day, if the compromises of the Constitution had no other proportions, qualities or consequences, than those of the most sublime of all humbugs, perpetrated, perpetrateable or conceivable.

The writer goes on:

“Already we hear a Mr. Voorhis of Indiana talking of compromise. Such a man, if not convicted of idiocy, should be suspected of treason. *What* is there to compromise? What mortal man can point it out? When the Constitution was made there was much to compromise. It was right that every State and every man should state all their interests and their demands. It was done. The negro-holders were allowed a representation of slaves in Congress, and the right to reclaim fugitives in other States.”

Among these Constitutional compromises there was another of these “rights” stated, demanded, defended and defined,” not here enumerated. It was the “right” to carry on the Slave Trade twenty years. But how, why, wherefore, was it *right* to carry on the Slave Trade twenty years, and *not* right to carry it on twenty years and twenty days? If it was right to limit that enormity to twenty years, why not right to limit it to twenty days, to

twenty hours, to twenty seconds? All the answer that can be given here is, that the right of it was the right to do as they felt forced to do, under desperate circumstances.

So of the other Constitutional compromises. If it was not right to make them worse, how was it right to make them so bad? If it was not right to grant a *five-fifths* vote on what was "defined" to be a piece of property, and treated as such—to the enslaving and degrading of themselves and their children, and the wronging of other millions—how was it right to grant a *three-fifths* vote, or a millionth part of a *one-fifth* vote, involving such results? Was slave-trading a better thing then than it is now? If you say it was more excusable, you must say the same of Constitutional kidnapping and Constitutional property-voting, to the defrauding of freedom. These are as much less excusable now than they were then, as the other. Then you must say we are less excusable [as we are infinitely] in reenacting them now, than they were in enacting them then. Just as slave-trading is more criminal in us in our circumstances, than it was in them in their circumstances, so are property-voting and fugitive kidnapping.

Slaveholding, slave-trading and kidnapping are in natural family relation, by affinity and consanguinity—whether in the Constitution or out of it. Kidnapping is as much worse in Ohio than in Dahomey, as Gov. Tod is higher in his moral pretensions than Badahung. So far is kidnapping from being made *not* kidnapping by being legalized, it is made all the more so and all the worse,—all the more demoralizing, because demoralizing in higher places,—all the more demoralizing in a republic than in a monarchy, because done by the people, who thus perpetrate self-demoralization. The organic law of the land, with kidnapping in it, is the same demoralizer, in kind, that it is with slave-trading in it. The Constitution which provides in fact for slave-holding, provides in effect for kidnapping and slave-trading. For a Constitution to provide for kidnapping and slave-trading at home, in Christendom, is as much more demoralizing than to provide for it abroad, in heathendom, as the moral pretensions of the former exceed those of the latter.

All who cherish regard for honesty, equity and humanity, will revolt at the idea that the organic law should provide in perspicuous language and plain terms, that the thousands have the right to rob the millions of knowledge, by depriving them of books and the benefits of intellectual culture, so that they can take advantage of their ignorance and steal from them their earnings, and rob them of their virtue, their children, their parents and their conjugal

companions. But these are the practices our Constitutional compromises provide for, in indirect language, prepared and arranged with study and care for these express purposes. The knowledge is forbidden and suppressed; the robbing is committed; the ravishing is perpetrated; the family relations are violated; the social ties are severed;—and men who, in spite of all this crushing treatment, can gain enough knowledge and summon enough energy to escape, are kidnapped by Northern biped hounds—made such by their Constitutional connection and complicity with the enormity—tied to horses, made to run till their shoes are off and the blood is bursting from the bottoms of their feet, fastened to trees and scourged to death;—other men who, stung to desperation by unendurable outrages of their personal, family and social rights, resent it as it is in the nature of man to resent, are chained and burnt to death.

The reason rendered why we may not be released from participation in these crimes against humanity is, that the Compromises of the Constitution hold us to the bargain. Such are the practical workings of the Constitutional compromises, in which this writer says, "every right of person and property was defined." Such are some of the rights of person and property defined in the Constitutional compromises. The Constitution, in the matter of these compromises, exerts mysterious power—magic power—making right and wrong convertible terms, equity and iniquity interchangeable terms, light and darkness identical things, good and evil blendable things. But—what is of consequence to us who are affected by it—the work comes out, the right merged in the wrong, the equity sunk in the iniquity, the light chased away by the darkness, the good overcome by the evil. It reverses nature. It carries the work of development backward and downward. It has caused the worst elements of the parents, instead of the better, to preponderate and predominate in the children. Instead of providing for peace and prosperity, it has provided for war and destruction.

What reply can be made to this, other than to say that the Constitution, as pertaining to these compromises, throws away the legitimate use of the word *right*, as elsewhere and otherwise used by itself?—and say that what it means here by *right* is, *whatever could be bargained for*, more or less, in this direction or that, equitably or iniquitously? This is it. The rights guaranteed by these Constitutional compromises, included the right to steal, rob and ravish—the right to deprive the millions of knowledge—the right to secure capital in the ownership of labor—the right to enthrone Slavery, and

banish freedom. This is the organic law of the land, that we are now called on to return to and reenact. This has been, and is to-day, the paramount consideration in the administration of the Government. The legitimate use of the word *right* is thrown away, as contemptibly sentimental. Practically, instead of adhering to right, to righteousness, we are held to the observance of a bargain involving us in the most flagrant iniquity and the most remorseless inhumanity.

This is it to-day, with our Constitutional Government, as pertaining to the matters of compromise; and these are made paramount, made sacred, made inviolable, made irrevocable, to the utter ignoring and abjuring of all legitimate right, all equity, all righteousness. The right is the might. The might is the right.

But, even going upon *this* ground, taking the Government on its own interpretation of the Constitution—it being to make the best bargain there is power to make—now is the time to substitute equity for iniquity, right for unrighteousness. Why not? Is there fear of reproaching the memory of our fathers, who “framed [this] mischief by a law” for us? Much is said deprecatory of doing anything transcending, or presuming to improve upon, the doings of our fathers. We are told that the Constitution as it came from their hands is good enough. What business, then, have we with improvements in implements of husbandry, ways and means of transportation, and munitions and engines of war?—with steel plows, steam plows, reaping machines, mowing machines and horse rakes—with railroads and steamboats—with revolvers, rifled cannons and iron-clad frigates? If the United States Constitution is a more important thing than these, it is just so much the more important that it should be changed, improved and adapted to the demands of development.

Let us inquire and consider for a moment, to ascertain and know if we can, something of what constitutes genuine regard for the memory of the fathers; and who they are that really, truly, in practice, entertain and cherish such regard. We are told that what is needed is, to “restore the Government to what it was in 1789, in the days of Washington.” The writer before alluded to, says this is “the first thing to do.”—As if our troubles had not come upon us legitimately. As if there were no connection between what was done then and what is being done now. As if we could have had this war without the compromises of the Constitution. As if like causes could be prevented producing like consequences.

Now if, in regard to one item in these compromises, it was for the fathers to say that twenty years

must suffice for the North to submit to *such* Southern outrage, how much more for us now to say, in regard to the other items, that seventy-five years must suffice for the North to have submitted to *such other* Southern outrages. Does any one pretend to think that our predecessors thought of binding their successors irrevocably in such a vassalage as they knew those compromises involved? Does any one pretend to think that the sovereign minority, who made the demand and obtained it, for the time, under the circumstances, expected the continuance of it through all time, under all circumstances? Why then was it not so specified? And why the provision for amendments? Why not have had it, “unalterable,” according to Seward?—or, “express and irrevocable,” according to Lincoln indorsing Seward? Grant that the majority did the best thing the circumstances would permit. And they did—as all others, in however fatal errors, have done. But we are in different circumstances, and are not justified in doing in ours as they did in theirs—infinately less are we justified in doing worse in ours than they did in theirs. It is for us to profit by the instructive history of what has resulted, and what is to-day resulting, from their imperfect doings, necessitated by lack of better development. It involves no uncharitableness toward them—no ungrateful reflection on them. Not to profit by these lessons of this history and this present experience, involves *us* in imbecility and impotency; and *this would* be dishonor to our illustrious, comparatively virtuous, potent progenitors.

Why, we have hung Gordon, the slave-trader—making his offense to be piracy. What business had we to hang him? We hung him for doing precisely what our fathers, in the Constitution, licensed to be done during twenty years—all but the difference between 1789 and 1862—and all this difference going to excuse them and to condemn us. To go back to 1789 with our Government would be to make ourselves guilty of the same crime for which we have hung Gordon—would be to make ourselves slave-traders and pirates of infinitely deeper dye than those of 1789. They were no such then in any such sense as we, thus doing, would be now. They had not the history and experience before them that we have before us; nor immunity, as we have, from fear of inimical nations.

Suppose that they, after providing for the amendment of the Constitution, had left the slave-trading part of the compromise unlimited in time—trusting to the virtue of themselves and their successors, to improve the Constitution in these and other regards. And suppose they had been able to expunge, and had expunged, that part, at the end of

ten years, instead of suffering it to go on twenty years.—Would it not have been a better work than they did do? If it was good to stop it at twenty, by the other process, would it not have been better to stop it at ten, by this process? Would it not have read better in history? Would it not have indicated better development attained to? Certainly, if they had licensed it for thirty years, all will agree in saying that would have been worse. Of course then ten would have been better; and one better still; and none best of all. Well, then, suppose they had limited the three-fifths vote part and the kidnapping part of the compromise to twenty years, or to ten years, or, leaving them as they did, that they had found their virtue equal to ending them in five years, or in any shorter term of time. Would not all this have read better in history?—been better in practice?

Besides all these considerations, when we look at the wording of the Constitution, and see how studiously its framers avoided using the words *slave* and *Slave Trade*, in constructing those compromises, it can not be doubted for an instant that a majority of them would rather not have made the compromise. And the evidence is the same that, after they had been driven to the desperate deed, they felt, and if their feelings had been recorded they would have said emphatically, let it be undone by amendment as soon as possible,—the sooner the better;—it is an iniquity and enormity that we deprecate the transmission of to posterity. All that is on record of what they did say on the matter, goes with these considerations to show that such were their feelings and desires—such their convictions and their prayers.

How faithless then in us, to the trust they reposed in our hands—the injunctions, the adjurations they impliedly laid on our heads—if we fail of this opportunity to amend. It is scarcely saying too much—it is hardly in the least a presumption—to say that if those of them who made up the final majority, coerced into that act of desperation, could have foreseen the consequences to follow, as they have followed, up to this hour, they would sooner have suffered the severance of their right hands than to have set their signatures to such a thing—a thing so productive of mischief and misery. It has not gone as a majority of them desired—it is not going to-day as they desired—in regard to these pernicious compromises. They did not desire to have the Slave Trade go on twenty years. They only suffered it, in a desperate emergency. They did not desire the property-voting and kidnapping under the Constitution. Much less did they intend provision for their perpetuity, their “unalterable-

ness,” their “irrevocableness,” as attempted by Seward, Corwin and Lincoln. Seward slandered them, scandalously, when he intimated that their work in this matter was a “cunning and insincere compact of pacification,” needing his interpretation for the worse. They only submitted for the time to what appeared to them stern necessity standing before them and hedging up their ways. Seward judged them from his own dollar and dime standard. They provided for amendments. They did not even leave it vague, with only *alteration*, *addition*, or *substitution*. Three times, in that brief fifth article, it reads “*amendments*”; and this, added to all the other considerations, makes it unmistakably plain that they meant progression, not retrogression—improving, not impairing—going forward and doing something worthy of enlarged powers and facilities, not going backward into worse than their own desperate conditions. This going-back doctrine—or even the *in-statuo-quo-ante-bellum* doctrine—is not fidelity to the ideas, the aspirations, the adjurations, of the majority among the makers of our Constitution; it is fealty to the conspiracies and treacheries of the minority. The evidence is irresistible. The intelligent coming historian, faithful to his convictions of essential truth, will so record it.

It is abuse of the Constitution then, and no legitimate use of it—it is defaming our fathers then, and not honoring them—to let slip this golden opportunity for going away with these Constitutional compromises, which have brought on us this anarchy and ruin. They have now collapsed into a lifeless letter, by the conduct of the insatiable successors of the rapacious minority. To re-enact them is to make ourselves unworthy successors of that better majority whose manifest intentions forbid our doing any such abominable thing. If they could now speak to us, they would pronounce us perfidious wretches for making the attempt or indulging the thought.

Will we go back seventy-five years, then, to go over again the barbarism and come out with the anarchy? Not that it will take seventy-five years now to arrive at like results, or worse. But we are sure of the results, in shorter and shorter periods, with increasing difficulties for the future, as they have been increasing all the while in the past.

Something is said about “State Sovereignty—State Allegiance”—by those who would take us back into compromise. The same writer says it [State Sovereignty—State Allegiance] “must be abolished forever.” Without arguing that question now, otherwise than as to its bearing on this matter of abolishing or perpetuating Slavery, it is sufficient to say that nothing is more clearly evident than that

in proportion as State Sovereignty is removed, or withheld, or provided against—with Slavery remaining—*national responsibility is assumed for the existence and perpetuity of that accursed institution,—that in this proportion the responsibility becomes national and is not sectional.* Herein is additional motive—if additional motive be needed—for utter and everlasting expungement and expurgation of all this rotten and ruinous affair of Constitutional compromise.

I have already intimated the propriety of, and justification for, taking Slavery on its own ground. Not conceding, in words or acts—as Slavery claims and proceeds—that the might is the right, to do wrong. But, whereas Slavery does *wrong* because it *can*, it is proper for us—*may*, is incumbent on us—to do *right* because we *can*.

No one, loyal to truth, freedom and honesty, will pretend to justify the framers of the Constitution in doing as they did, in selling themselves and their children into slavery to Slavery, except on the ground that they had to do as they could—as the ruling power would permit. They had to let Slavery displace freedom because it could. How much more proper and justifiable for the friends of freedom to make freedom to displace Slavery the moment they can. If it were only an affair of dollars and dimes between man and man, we could think of magnanimity, and indulge in generosity—could *compromise* without demoralizing ourselves. We have a right to compromise in things that are *ours*, with others in things that are *theirs*. But we have no right to compromise the rights of others—to bargain to help a second party to rob and despoil a third party, wresting from them all that is dearest and most sacred. If the second party have at any time had it in their power to force us into such service, it is for us to extricate ourselves, the moment we recover power. Not to do it, is wronging ourselves, wronging the third party, wronging the *second* party—[for the wrong-doer is always self-demoralized, and of course self-wronged, in his wronging of others; and of course is wronged by those who help him on in his wrong—] wronging posterity. We have no right to sell our children into slavery to Slavery. If Slavery can at any time, under any circumstances, master us and force us to sign the deed, making a bill of sale of our children and their services for Slavery's benefit, we have the right to destroy the writing, burn the parchment, or trample it in the mire and dirt, the moment we can lay hold of it. If it is always kept from *our* reach, our children have a right to destroy it, the moment *they* can lay hold of it. This right is founded in the fact that it was *always*, all the while, an illegitimate trans-

action. It was the work of illegitimate power. All this being common sense, indisputable truth and unquestionable honesty, it follows that the compromises of the Constitution, involving us in slavery to Slavery, are to be trampled out of our way the moment we have power to get them under our feet. If we shrink from doing it, we are children unworthy of our ancestry—coward, cringing slaves, fit to be in the most ignominious bondage under such tyranny as we are now contending with, compromising with, submitting to.

One of three destructions is before the American people, and is inevitable—destruction of *Slavery*, destruction of *freedom*, or destruction of *peace*. Beyond these, outside of these, there is no election. We, at least of the North, have become triflers, contemptible, unconscionable triflers. With the greatest questions before us that can occupy intelligent beings, we submit to the intrigues and dictates of caucus. Caucus, when it finds occasion, which is often, carries its measures and accomplishes its purposes by multiplying candidates. But the matter in hand for the consideration of the American people at this hour, in this crisis, is not to be disposed of by multiplying numbers to choose from. The problem to be solved is in the triangle here presented.

Already the audacity of those who strike for the destruction of freedom, has shown itself in the shape of a move in the State Legislature, to make it treason to stand up and advocate the abolishment of Slavery. The same murderous spirit toward Abolitionists, has shown itself there, that is manifested by Brownlow and the Border-State press and pulpit. The sympathizers with the Southern conspiracy have dared to desecrate the Capitol of this State, with the out-throat cry of treason, against the advocates of freedom. It is clamor, it is mad-dog decrial, to turn attention away from their own misdoings. When and where the advocacy of freedom is treason, then and there the advocacy of Slavery is loyalty. The government that suffers itself thus to be identified is a detestable tyranny—an execrable oppression. Leagues are forming all over the land to consummate this reign of terror. Let us not deceive ourselves, blind ourselves, nor undertake to comfort ourselves—for we shall not find peace and safety—in the fact that formidableness of numbers did not venture to appear on that occasion. There is more of that assassin-sentiment and sympathy lurking in the dark among us and around us, than has yet dared to make show in the light. It is in high places. Our mobs are not self-moved. Our small politicians are not self-inspired. The baser elements of our barbarism have higher affinities. The "baser sort" of the brotherhood are in

consanguinity with more exalted confraternities. This malignant sentiment is a power in our State and National Legislatures, and in the command of our armies. The Cabinet is tainted with it; and the "better half" in the White House is under its control. The press is extensively under the same influence and in the same service, doing dastardly, treacherous work at undermining freedom.

Jefferson Davis is a less infamous foe to freedom than they of the North who by his acts have been put in possession of power to abolish Slavery, and refuse to use that power for the accomplishment of that work. Jefferson Davis and Alexander H. Stephens have been made the genuine children of Slavery under the legitimate operations of the Constitutional compromise. True to their instincts thus created, they and their coadjutors have relieved the North and the Government from all Constitutional obligations to Slavery. Thus relieved from hindrances and put in possession of power, they who refuse to use the power to put away Slavery, act a more infamous part than Jefferson Davis and Alexander H. Stephens.

The Southern soldiery are in the same relation to Davis, Stephens & Co., that our mobs are to our operators in such *trade* as fraternizes with Slavery. Davis, Stephens & Co. are in the same relations to Slavery that our Northern operators are to such trade. Trade, as ulterior cause, on the part of the Northern party, in this infernal business, moves our operators, and these move the mobs. Slavery, the ultimate cause on the part of the Southern party, and of both parties and all parties, in this accursed work, moves Davis, Stephens & Co., and they move the Southern soldiery.—All, together, thus moved, are at work against human freedom. It is the consumer putting the producer in the place that will best serve the consumer's purposes. It is capital against labor. It is capital determined to control labor. It is capital striving to own labor.

In this statement of the case, I have made Slavery ultimate cause, in this atrocious transaction; and therefore I reason that Slavery should be removed, for the relief of humanity—for human enlargement and improvement—for the establishment and reign of righteousness and peace.

Does any one say here that it proves too much—that it equally makes out a case against trade, in the place I have given it among the causes; so that trade must be abolished too, to effect my purposes?—My reply is, that all trade based on the same illegitimate basis with Slavery—that makes "merchandize of slaves and souls of men"—all trade that involves treason against mankind—all trade that is privateering and piracy—is to be abolished and

forever removed. But with the abolishment of Slavery, trade will become more legitimate. Otherwise, truth, honesty and equity are without significance.

It is Slavery that has warred upon the Government, and made itself an outlaw. The people that don't know enough to know this, and to demand action of the Government accordingly, are fit to be enslaved still further by Constitutional compromises. The Government that lacks the virtue to proceed against Slavery in accordance with this fact, is fit to be set aside and superseded.

There has been supererogatory scrupulousness about warring upon Slavery—wretched trifling about letting Slavery war upon the Government—and, what is worst of all, unconscionable ignoring of its warring upon human freedom. The Republican paper, of all the political papers in the whole country, making the bravest fight against Slavery, even the New York Tribune, has not thought it *politic* to call on the Government to make *direct* war upon Slavery. Herein is one of the most terrible evidences of the terrible nature of the hold Slavery has on the sentiment, the conscience, of the Nation. No political publisher dares to proclaim that it is, or that it *should be*, the *purpose* of the war to destroy Slavery—even the papers that have declared it their full conviction that it is the *purpose* of Slavery to destroy the Government and freedom. There is nowhere in the conduct of the political press, the manliness, the honesty, the fidelity to human interests, to call on the Federal Government to identify itself with the cause of human freedom—with the cause of freedom for the people of this Nation. It is only to preserve itself—what it has been for three-quarters of a century—the preserver of Slavery. The New York Tribune, throughout this year of war, has done nothing else over and over, in behalf of the Government, so much as it has repeated the declaration that it is not the business of the war to abolish Slavery. Other leading Republican journals have done the same. *As often, and as perspicuously, they have shown that Slavery has forfeited all Constitutional claims, not only for protection, but for exemption from abolishment.* Never, never, will this war, that is wasting life and treasure, scourging the present generation and cursing posterity, accomplish anything for freedom and peace, till this heartless trifling is done with, and the enemy that has grappled the Government and throttled freedom is grappled with and throttled by the Government.

The Administration, in the management of this war, blunders on an *if*—an *if* that threatens to prove fatal.—It is waiting to see whether the assassin or the victim is the stronger; and then it will

decide whether or not the former is worthy of death or bonds. *If Slavery don't let go its grasp on the throat of the Government, it is gently intimated that the time may come when the struggle may result in serious consequences to the conspiracy. If Slavery is likely to prove itself too strong for the Government, and if the Government becomes convinced that it is so, then the Government may find itself under necessity of casting about to find measures for self-preservation. But the first duty of Government is made and held to be, to see that Slavery does not get harmed until it shows itself dangerous—not to freedom, but to the bricks, mortar and fossils of Washington City. Slavery has Constitutional rights that it is of paramount importance to the Government to preserve intact. As for the Constitutional rights of freedom—if such things exist or can be conceived of—they will have to be seen about, if at all, afterward. Seriously, it seems to be, that the Constitutional rights of freedom are always to be set aside and left untended to, because they present difficulties and dangers. But who ever heard of any difficulties or dangers attending the enforcement of the Constitutional rights of Slavery? Who ever heard of any one being mobbed for saying that Slavery ought not to be abolished, but ought to be nourished and cherished?*

During the Crimean war, Turkey was treated as the "sick man" of the East. The case of our Country is the case of a man with sick-headache, in which the brain is affected by bad stomach. What shall be the remedy? Will you cut off the man's head?—or extract the bile from his stomach? Abolitionists say, extract the bile,—or, if it be a case of poison, pump out the poison, and save the life. Put away Slavery, and save the victim.

This war will never cease, till Slavery rules or is itself ruined. There may be show of flags of truce. There may be armistices between Northern and Southern politicians. There may be renewed compromise and patched-up peace, for the present purposes of political gamblers. But there will be an increased standing army and navy, and increasing standing animosity—pent fires that will pour out lava and desolate the land—that will produce earthquakes, and swallow up the race of idiots and lunatics that have employed themselves kindling and feeding such fires.

Constitutional compromise now lies self-slain—at least self-paralyzed. To revive and reinvigorate it, is to give life and energy to a moral monster, demonstrated to have been, by every act of its existence, the mortal enemy of republican institutions and human well-being.

The enemies of freedom have handed over the Constitution into the hands of freedom's friends—at least those who profess to be, and should be, the friends of freedom. If these prove morally unequal to the position they are thus placed in—unworthy of such a trust—treacherous under such a responsibility—on their memories will justly fall the curses of the coming generations.

What It Costs.

Putting down the Slaveholders' Rebellion is very expensive as well as bloody business. Congress, at its recent session, passed bills which, in the aggregate, appropriated out of the Treasury the sum of \$913,078,527 63. At the Extra Session, last Summer, Congress appropriated \$265,103,296 99. The total amount, therefore, for the two sessions reaches the enormous sum of \$1,178,181,824 62. Nearly all of this vast outlay was rendered necessary by the Rebellion. At the recent session, the Army bill alone appropriated within a fraction of \$559,000,000—an amount larger, no doubt, than was ever before embraced in one law or decree of any Government on earth. Look at the aggregate of the two sessions—Eleven Hundred and Seventy-eight Millions, One Hundred and Eighty-one Thousand, Eight Hundred and Twenty-four Dollars, and Sixty-two Cents—and tell us if the work of crushing out this "irregular opposition" to the National Government, which "our misguided Southern brethren" have organized, will not only make them expensive relatives to their cotemporaries, but cause their memories to be very *dear* to posterity?

—[New York Tribune.

That the "cotemporaries" of "our Southern brethren" will see serious times enough, even in the matter of dollars and cents, there is not much doubt, but posterity, instead of having burdens imposed upon it by this war, will reap, in results of it, the richest blessings. Blessed is he, now, who either has a God worth believing in, or else has faith in the Eternal Principles, that they will work out ultimate justice and good to humanity. The enormous debt now being incurred, will never be paid. The Government will pay the interest of its debt, for a short time, in promises. There need be no worry about any other payment. The holders of United States bonds and notes will be by the amount of these the poorer. This is all there will be of it. It will be no trouble to posterity. It will soon be paid, as the debts of other bankrupts are paid. Bank currency will be of no more value than Treasury notes. If the Government lives long enough to collect the taxes that will be necessary, property will not command current funds enough to pay them. All things will tend towards an equalization of property; monopolies will be broken up; and posterity will reap advantages corresponding to the present sufferings.

F. B.

THE NEW REPUBLIC.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, AUGUST 2, 1862.

FRANCIS BARRY, EDITOR.

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS:

ZERAH MASTERS, C. M. OVERTON,
ORSON S. MURRAY.

THE NEW REPUBLIC is published weekly, at one dollar a year; six months, fifty cents; single copies (post paid) three cents.

For sale at No. 288 Superior Street.

Remittances should be made in bills of Ohio, Eastern, Indiana State, or Detroit banks, Treasury notes, coin or stamps. Address,

NEW REPUBLIC,
CLEVELAND, Ohio.

Is the President not only the Executive, but the Alpha and Omega of the Legislative?

When the President sent a special message to Congress, prescribing a resolution, in form, for Congress to adopt, "initiating" a process for emptying the pockets of the robbed laborers of the North into the pockets of the robbers of laborers North and laborers South; and the N. Y. Tribune expressed a hope that Congress would not vary it a comma; and Congress in hot haste, almost unanimously, and almost or quite without the alteration of the comma, adopted it, it seemed to me a singular proceeding. It appeared to me that the President's signature at the other end of the proceeding would have been sufficient—that his signature in advance was altogether gratuitous—at any rate the formation of what was to be signed.

But it seems now that legislation in the form of a resolution is not all the form of legislation that may originate, as well as terminate, with the Executive. It appears that not only execution but legislation—particularly when it is to gratify and pacify conspirators against the Government—may commence, as well as end, in form, with the Executive. It seems to be the peculiar function of the "Public Functionary" who has been managing our affairs for us with such "masterly inactivity" for sixteen months past, to prepare bills for Congress as well as resolutions. On the 14th of July, 1862, he sent to Congress what is called a "message," in the following form:

Fellow-Citizens of the Senate
and House of Representatives:

Herewith is the draft of the bill to compensate any State which may abolish Slavery within its limits, the passage of which substantially as presented I respectfully and earnestly recommend.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Be it enacted, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any State shall have lawfully abolished Slavery within and throughout such State, either immediately or gradually, it shall be the duty of the President, assisted by the Secretary of the Treasury, to prepare and deliver to each State an amount of six per cent. interest-bearing

bonds of the United States equal to the aggregate value at — dollars per head of the slaves within such State as reported by the census of 1860, the whole amount for any one State to be delivered at once if the abolishment be immediate, or in equal annual installments if it be gradual, interest to begin running on each bond at the time of delivery, and not before.

And be it further enacted, That if any State having so received any such bonds shall at any time afterward, by law, re-introduce or tolerate Slavery within its limits, contrary to the act of abolishment upon which such bonds shall have been received, said bonds so received by said State shall at once be null and void, in whose soever hands they may be, and such State shall refund to the States all interest which may have been paid on such bonds.

Herein we have further interpretation of the significance of his language, when he tells the people, on his way to Washington, and at other times and elsewhere, that it is for them to support him in his administration. It is for him to devise plans for the gratification of slaveholders, and for the people to furnish the blood to be spilt and the money to be squandered for those patriotic and humane purposes.

[By the way—to digress here a moment—what single word has fallen from the lips of Abraham Lincoln, during his administration, in behalf of freedom and humanity? What, in the prosecution of the war, has he manifested, but the politician, forced on by "military necessity"—and all in subservience to Slavery?]

Has it been the practice of President Lincoln's predecessors to frame resolutions and bills for Congress, and send them forward in form, calling them messages? Has it been the practice of his predecessors to frame vetoes in advance, and hold them as threatening rods over the heads of Congress, to bring their legislation into subservency to the sovereign wills of their dictators? I am no lawyer; and make no pretensions to statesmanship. Have read the Constitution of the United States several times through. Times enough to have no great veneration for it as a thing of consistency. Times enough to be convinced that, like the Bible, and the Christian's god and devil, it is a "kingdom divided against itself," and therefore "can not stand." But I have a right to take its venerators and advocates on their own ground, and hold them accountable where they hold themselves accountable. But especially in connection do I want to have those who talk about freedom—whatever have been their thoughts and feelings about it—to see how the Constitution, in these times, is forced into the service of Slavery, in the hands of Slavery's Janus-faced servitors now in power.

Article I, Sec. 1 of the Constitution, specifies and defines that:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Sec. 7 specifies and defines that:

"All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

It being nowhere specified and defined where all other bills, except for revenue, shall originate, I had had no other thought than that they should originate either in the House of Representatives or in the Senate—inasmuch as in these two bodies are invested ALL LEGISLATIVE POWERS. True, Article II, providing for an Executive and defining his powers, says, in Sec. 3:

"He shall, from time to time, give to Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

But whoever will read through Sections 2 and 3 of this Article II, must think that enough is made to devolve on a President of ordinary capacities, without his taking it upon himself to prescribe to Congress resolutions and bills, in form.

If it be proper for him to prescribe bills in form, and proper to prepare vetoes in advance against altering a comma, the first article of the Constitution might as well be dispensed with, and the legislative powers be merged in the executive at once and altogether.

O. S. M.

New System of Representation.

I referred last week to a plan, previously proposed, by which a true representation could be secured; and also to the fact that Horace Greeley and Wendell Phillips both advocated the idea which constitutes one of the leading features of the plan. When the idea was first presented in the NEW REPUBLIC I supposed it entirely new, but I find that it had previously been advocated in the Tribune. Wendell Phillips refers to Stewart Mill, of England, as the proposer of the idea. This is little matter, yet the influence of "great names" is always potent with the masses.

The idea proposed is that of allowing the voters to cast their suffrages for the men of their first choice, without regard to locality. For instance, Horace Greeley, James Gordon Bennett, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Gerrit Smith, Charles Sumner, Andrew Jackson Davis, Fernando Wood, Henry Ward Beecher, Brigham Young, and as many more as had friends who wished to see them in Congress, could be voted for by their friends in all parts of the Country, and elected; though possibly not having supporters enough in their own immediate locality, to procure them even a nomination by a primary meeting. By this plan the interests and views of all classes, and all individuals, would be fairly represented, as each voter would give his (or her) suffrage to the man who, of all the Nation, could most perfectly represent him. As real representation is, in a popular government, the leading and most important idea, there need be nothing more said in favor of this plan, than that it allows the people, in every instance, to vote for their first choice, instead of being obliged to vote for some one in their own district, and that one

the choice of the politicians, but not necessarily of the people.

Another incalculable moral advantage this plan has over the one in use, is, that the influence of morally elevated minorities, now in a sense and to a great extent lost, in the halls of legislation, would have its full force and weight. Had this plan been in operation, Gerrit Smith would have been in Congress for the last twenty years. What would not the eloquence of a Phillips, or the stern honesty and logic of a Garrison, have accomplished for justice and humanity, could the appreciators of these men, all over the Country, have sent them as their representatives to Congress. If it happens that these particular individuals, for reasons to them sufficient, would have refused the seats they could have taken, the principle is not impaired. Horace Greeley, with his practical common sense, and glorious old hatred of meanness, would not have staid at home as a rule, because New York City politicians so decreed.

What other features Mill, Greeley and Phillips would have incorporated, I do not know. But the simple idea of allowing the voter to vote without regard to locality, with no other essential change from the present plan, would be, it seems to me, radically incomplete. Instead of having the number of representatives fixed, and each member casting one vote, as now, I would have the whole popular vote cast (by proxy) on every question or measure; each member casting as many votes as he or she had received suffrages. This idea is absolutely essential to true representation. Thus, instead of each member casting one vote, I would have a list of the votes each member had received, each member's number being placed opposite his name, and in calling the roll in taking the vote, each member's number, instead of his name, should be placed in the yea or nay column, as the case might be; and the aggregate majority should decide the question, and not the majority of members. This would be simply just and fair; would be simply representation. Nothing else would be just and fair; nothing else would be true representation.

Suppose Horace Greeley to receive in the whole Country, one hundred thousand votes. Suppose Gerrit Smith to receive ten thousand, and Mr. Logan of Illinois to receive five thousand. Why should the hundred thousand voting for Greeley count only half as much as the fifteen thousand voting for Smith and Logan? The idea is absurd. The whole popular vote should be cast, on every question. All the members are for is to represent their constituents—to cast their votes. If a few voters had the shrewdness to send a man of extraordinary power, like Wendell Phillips, who might exert more moral influence than some member who had received a much larger number of votes, it would be their privilege, it would be legitimate. But for the full-headed Horace Greeley, the representative of a hundred thousand intelligent voters, to count no more, in the

vote, than some "fourth-rate county-court lawyer," who might manage to get a seat there, would be stupendously ridiculous.

I would not have the number of members limited, except as the number would be naturally limited. The tendency would be to vote only for "first-class" men; and a few of these would get nearly all the votes. The "Gerrit Smith men," all over the Country, would vote for Gerrit Smith. The Garrisonians would nearly all vote for Garrison or Phillips, rather than for any of the "lesser lights" of the Party. Douglas, if alive, and a candidate, would go into Congress with half a million of votes. Thus the ablest if not the best men, would fill our halls of legislation; and there would be an exhibition of ability if not honesty. Congress would no longer be made up of fourth-rate lawyers, to the infinite discredit of the Nation.

But I would have all the expenses of the sessions divided equally among the members, requiring them to look to their constituents for their support; and this would have a decided effect to prevent the accumulation of a Congress too numerous and unwieldy. A mere fraction of voters could not afford to send a member under these circumstances, and no man would accept a seat to cast a mere handful of votes. The few who should thus vote should be allowed to change their votes; and it would be no great hardship to have only a second choice, with the whole number elected to choose from. But usually there would be a concert of action on the part of voters that would obviate any such necessity.

The members should not be elected for a specified term; but at every regular local election, the voters should have the privilege of changing their votes from the person previously voted for, and bestowing them upon some other person. Thus each member would continue to represent only those who continued to prefer him. The voting would have to be done openly, and a record of the voting kept. In this way the person elected would be constantly and especially amenable to the people; and, integrity aside, the temptation would be to please the people and consult their interests. And the idea should be constantly borne in mind, that in a representative government the duty of the representative is simply to truly represent his constituents. I know there is a positively ruling power which the wise and good exert over the mass. These are the genuine rulers, ruling by virtue of their inherent powers and capabilities. But this ruling power is a moral one, and must not be confounded with the prerogatives of the representative. The representative, as such, is simply an agent, and not necessarily a ruler. The Rulers of this Nation are the men who shape the public sentiment of the Nation. Horace Greeley is more a ruler than Abraham Lincoln. The reason our Nation is going to destruction, is because its leaders and rulers, for the most part, have been "blind leaders of the blind."

Suppose Wm. H. Seward, under this plan, had,

in his better days, received two hundred thousand Anti-Slavery votes. His subsequent course would have lost him at least a hundred thousand of these votes—they would have been withdrawn from him and given to Sumner, Phillips, Smith, Wade, or some other true exponent of the Anti-Slavery sentiment. Thus Government, instead of being a drag upon the people, instead of being lower than the people, and behind the people, and forever misrepresenting and disgracing them, would keep steady pace with them and be a true exponent of their wishes. According to this plan James Buchanan would have been thrust out of the Presidential Chair, by an overwhelming vote, a whole year sooner than he was obliged to leave, by the expiration of his term; and the disgraceful proceedings that resulted in this war might have been prevented. What a ridiculous picture was it of James Buchanan occupying the Executive Chair, that last year! Is not Government, as thus illustrated, the supremest humbug?

F. B.

"Do Spare Poor Lincoln."

An esteemed friend writes to me:

"I have no hope for the Nation, except through death and resurrection. Let us let them die easy. Do spare poor Lincoln. The Administration can not long survive."

I thank this friend sincerely for giving me this occasion for a brief explanation. I had begun to apprehend that those who do not see the matter as I see it, must be tired of my giving Lincoln so much attention. I should have been tired of it myself, long ago, and have quit it, but that it is not Lincoln I have been giving attention to—it is the President of the United States—the Executive of the Government boasting itself the best in the world—the Commander-in-Chief of the noblest army marshaled in modern times. When I see this "Public Functionary," either through imbecility or inhumanity, or both, slaughtering this noble host by the hundred-thousand or more in a campaign, and repeating his calls for the ranks to be filled; and all in sacrifice to Slavery; and then I must be aggravated with the senseless sing-song, that all this monstrous murder, perpetrated for the preservation and protection of a system compounded and exclusively composed of crimes, enormities and infamies such as the darkness nowhere else hides, is the work of a well-meaning man acting quite innocently—I confess my indignation is irrepressible. If men must be silent on such occasion, the stones must certainly be suffered to cry out. Read Senator Chandler's expose of this most monstrous maladministration, and tell me if a tithe of justice would not long ago have pitched Lincoln and McClellan headlong into the sea of human blood they have shed, with mill-stones about their necks.

O. S. M.

P. S.—About the time the ink of the foregoing paragraph is dry, the news comes that Halleck, the

author of that infamous order No. 3, has been appointed by the President, General-in-Chief of all the land forces of the United States. That order is still standing, excluding all fugitives from the army of the Western Department; and a like order is standing in regard to the army of the Potomac. All this in defiance of an act of Congress to the contrary. And now, at the end of all this, we are told that the President is taking it upon himself to have slaves employed to establish him in his bloody political reign, and then return them to Slavery! The treason of the Southern President is against the United States. The treason of the Northern President is against Humanity. By as much as Humanity is greater and better than a Government that is treacherous and false to Humanity, by so much is the Northern President's crime and infamy blacker than that of the Southern. And if the people will continue to sustain such acts of treason against Humanity, by as much as they are more responsible than the instrumentality they use, by so much are they more reprehensible than that instrumentality. And now suffer me to go one step further, and I will for this time forbear. From the people then let me go back with the responsibility to the press. The press is the power behind the people. It boasts of being this power. It moves the people, and glories in it. I do say then that the perfidious press which persists in pushing the people thus treasonably in this time of Humanity's sorest trial, is the most perfidious and disloyal of all.

O. S. M.

The Strength of Union.

If my feeble voice could reach my fellow-countrymen, in their workshops, in the streets, in the fields, and wherever they meet together; if for one moment I could take to my lips the silver trumpet, whose tones should sound and reverberate throughout the land, I would summon all, forgetting prejudice and turning away from error, to help unite, quicken and invigorate our common Country,—most beloved now that it is most imperilled,—to a compactness and bigness of virtue in just proportion to its extended dominions, so that it should be as one huge Christian personage, one mighty growth and stature of an honest man, instinct with all the singleness of unity. Thus inspired, the gates of hell cannot prevail against us. Such concord will give quickness to our armies, so that the hosts of the Rebellion will be broken and scattered as by the thunderbolt, and will give to our beneficent Government that blessed inspiration, better than any newly raised levies, by which the Rebellion shall be struck in its single vulnerable part; by which that colossal abomination which was its original main-spring, and is its present motive-power, shall be overthrown, and by which the cause of the Union shall be linked with that divine justice whose weapons are of celestial temper.—[Charles Sumner.

A Wet Blanket.

We print this morning a "War Bulletin" from headquarters, whereby the Union Commanders in the unequivocally Rebel States (not including Tennessee, nor, of course, Kentucky, Missouri, &c.,) are directed to make free with property needed by their armies, and to employ "persons of African descent," when required as laborers, &c. Those laborers are to be paid, but not a word is said as to their being freed. On the contrary, the natural inference from the terms of this order would be that they are to be finally returned to their former owners, no matter though these be the most malignant traitors.

If this is all that is to be done by the Government in obedience to the Confiscation-Emancipation Act, then the Union cause will have been fatally wounded in the house of its friends. No equivocating, higgling, hair-splitting, hang-back policy will now save it. Unless the slaves are given to understand—and that speedily—that the Union wants their services enough to give them liberty therefor, then the Rebellion can never be put down. This Country is very strong; but it is not strong enough to subdue eight millions of white rebels in perfect subjection to a relentless military despotism, while we unite with it in keeping four millions of black slaves at work in the fields, the arsenals, the trenches of those rebels.

We speak plainly, for in this crisis it were treason to be silent or ambiguous. Unless the slaves are afforded ample and palpable inducements for quitting the service of the rebels, and embarking in that of the Union, the great mass of them will continue to serve their masters while the latter destroy the Nation. And this order does not supply the slaves generally of rebels with an adequate reason for braving peril, privation and death, by a speedy flight from the house of bondage to the sheltering folds of the flag of the free.

Of course, we do not know that the President will stop here. We trust he will not. Yet the appearance of this order would seem to indicate that nothing further is contemplated. If that be the fact, we sadly feel that the Nation is undone.

—[New York Tribune, July 24.

Profligacy consists not in spending years of time or chests of money,—but in spending them off the line of your career. Nothing is beneath you, if it is in the direction of your life: nothing is great or desirable, if it is off from that. I think we are entitled here to draw a straight line, and say, that society can never prosper, but must always be bankrupt, until every man does what he was created to do.—[Emerson.

The Soul.

Soul, alas! is unregarded; Brothers it is closely shut:
 All unknown as royal Alfred in the Saxon neath-
 erd's hut;
 In the Dark house of the Body, cooking victuals,
 lighting fires,
 Swelters on the starry stranger, to our nature's
 base desires.
 From its lips is't any marvel, that no revelations
 come?
 We have wronged it; we do wrong it—'tis ma-
 jestically dumb!
 God! our souls are aproned waiters! God! our
 souls are hired slaves:
 Let us hide from Life, my Brothers! let us hide us
 in our graves.
 O! why stain our holy childhoods? Why sell all
 for drinks and meats?
 Why degrade, like those old mansions, standing in
 our pauper streets,
 Lodgings once of kings and nobles, silken stirs and
 trumpet's din,
 Now, where crouch 'mong rags and fever, shapes
 of squalor and of sin?
 Like a mist this wall surrounds me; Brothers, hush!
 the Lord Christ's hands
 Ev'n now are stretched in blessings o'er the sea and
 o'er the lands.
 Sit not like a mourner, Brother! by the grave of
 that dear Past,
 Throw the Present! 'tis thy servant only when 'tis
 overcast,—
 Give battle to the leagued world, if thou'rt worthy,
 truly brave,
 Thou shalt make the hardest circumstance a help-
 er or a slave,
 As when the thunder wraps the setting sun, he
 struggles, glows with ire,
 Rifts the gloom with golden furrows, with a hun-
 dred bursts of fire
 Melts the black and thund'rous masses to a sphere
 of rosy light,
 Then on edge of glowing heaven smiles in triumph
 on the night.
 Lo! the song of Earth—a maniac's on a black and
 dreary road—
 Rises up, and swells, and grandeurs, to the loud
 triumphal ode—
 Earth casts off a slough of darkness, an eclipse of
 hell and sin,
 In each cycle of her being, as an adder casts her
 skin;
 Lo! I see long blissful ages, when these mammon
 days are done,
 Stretching like a golden ev'ning forward to the
 setting sun.

—[Alexander Smith.]

What Justice?

What justice is there in our modern custom, that
 scarcely frowns at the guilty man—sometimes
 laughs at and even patronizes him—and pouts all
 the vials of wrath and condemnation on the guilty
 woman—her guilt itself often the result of his false-
 hood and his meanness. What justice, what honor,
 what delicacy, O refined woman! who, recoiling
 with virtuous scorn from that fallen sister, will wel-
 come with brilliant homage him by whom she fell.
 I suppose the mantle of Christian charity should
 cover everybody. But, perhaps, we ought to allow
 for a little natural shrinkage; and if there is any-
 body that it won't cover, and that ought to have the
 privilege of lying outside the hem of it, in the cold
 blast and the biting frost, it is that man who trades
 in woman's affection—who drags her down to ruin
 —who leaves her to suffer the guilt—who goes on,
 smiling, to new conquests, and boasts of his victory.
 Smooth, smiling, flattered, honored, welcomed in re-
 fined society, entertained in respectable homes—
 when his only use in the world seems to be to make
 men believe in a devil, or rather to make them feel
 that any particular devil is unnecessary.

—[Rev. E. H. Chapin.]

Who Would Have Believed?

How many would have regarded our words with
 seriousness, had we told them in '59 that a movement
 would be begun in '60, that would within two years
 later change the character of this political arrange-
 ment of ours? Who would not have sneered, and
 ridiculed, to be told that blood would so soon flow
 as it has already flowed, and that the land would
 be shrouded in mourning? Who would not smile
 grimly now, to be told that it may be that pesti-
 lence is yet to follow close in the track of war—ty-
 phus in the footsteps of victory—and ravage the
 land with its terribly fatal breath, carrying woe and
 desolation to every hearthstone and family altar?

For a long time, our friends have, from the high-
 er spirit plane, been speaking of these latter days.
 They saw the gathering clouds, and heard the mut-
 tering tempest. They communicated freely their
 impressions of what was yet to be, always seeking
 to make it understood that we were at the verge of a
 new epoch, from which the world will take a start
 on the path of liberal ideas such as few persons
 presume to dream of.—[Banner of Light.]

A true man will always find his best counsel in
 that inspiration which a good cause never fails to
 give him at the instant of trial. All history teaches
 us that great results are ruled by a wise Providence,
 and we are but units in the great plan.

—[John C. Fremont.]

PROSPECTUS
OF THE
NEW REPUBLIC.

At a time so momentous as the present, there is an imperative demand for the exercise of all the wisdom, heroism, self-sacrifice, charity, and the forgetting of all past differences, and the sinking of all worldly ambition, in one sublime, prayerful, determined, brotherly effort to save our beloved country from the terrible ruin that more than threatens to swallow up our liberties, prosperity, peace. How to conquer the rebels, is not all of the great problem that must be settled before there is any certainty that we, as a Nation, have anything in the future to hope for.

The **NEW REPUBLIC** has two leading and distinctive objects: First, by humble and modest, but earnest and thorough effort, to promote, to the fullest extent of its ability, that fraternity of feeling among all parties and classes of society, on which our salvation so vitally depends. Second, to discuss, in a free, untrammelled manner, but in no partizan, dogmatical or dictatorial spirit, all of those fundamental and practical questions and principles of Government and human rights which the adjustment of our National politics will involve.

Society is divided into three distinct and leading classes. The Radical Reformer, the Liberal Conservative, and the opponent of Progress. The tendencies of the times are toward a union of the first two classes. No radical reform or idea has been advocated, but has embodied an important, though possibly mixed and partial truth. The agitation of single reforms, has been useful mainly in the way of preparing the public mind for a comprehensive understanding and thorough adjustment of, the great political and social questions that lie at the basis of our National happiness and well-being. The law of extremes and equilibrium is a universal law. Extremisms in reform have been necessary to balance the opposite extreme of stationary conservatism. The illustration has been that of extremes; the tendency now is toward equilibrium.

The aim of the **NEW REPUBLIC** will be to combine an earnest and energetic radicalism with a wise conservatism. It will advocate all rational reforms, and seek to promote a greater unity of feeling, and concert of action, and comprehensiveness of view, among all classes of reformers. It will take sides with no party, and will never be involved in personal or party quarrels, of any kind, or in any degree. So far as it acknowledges and follows leadership, Jesus Christ will be its standard in morals, and Thomas Jefferson in politics. It will advocate a reconstruction in our Government so far as to allow of a settlement of the Slavery question in such a manner as not to involve the sacrifice of justice, freedom, human rights, a sound policy and the Nation's safety, on the one hand, or unconstitutional and despotic methods on the other. It will advocate a radical revolution in politics and governmental administration, so far as there has been a departure from the Jeffersonian Platform, and systematic and persistent violation of the fundamental principles of the Government. It will be an especial advocate of simplicity and economy in Government, and attempt to demonstrate the correctness of the doctrine that "that Government is best that governs least." It will advocate a uniform and national system of currency, a uniform and humane system of prison discipline, uniform marriage and divorce laws, a new and improved system of representation, and present suggestive ideas on the subject of schools, internal improvements, post-office regulations &c. It will also give the thoughts of the ablest writers on Anthropological and Physiological science.

It will not aim to be a news-paper, but will note and comment upon, the World's progress, and the leading events of the times.

TERMS: At the rate of one dollar a year for any length of time. Address,

NEW REPUBLIC,
Cleveland, O.

Reform Journals.

We propose, as a token of fraternal appreciation, and for the convenience of our readers, to keep standing in our columns, for a few weeks, the following list (which may be enlarged from time to time) of Reform Journals.

BANNER OF LIGHT.

A large weekly journal, devoted to Spiritualism and Reform literature.—Luther Colby Editor. Two dollars a year. Address, Banner of Light, Boston, Mass.

LIBERATOR.

A leading Garrisonian journal—free for the discussion of all subjects.—Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Editor. Two dollars and fifty cents a year. 221 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

INVESTIGATOR.

Infidel journal.—Horace Seaver, Editor. Two dollars a year. 103 Court St., Boston, Mass.

PINE AND PALM.

Anti-Slavery.—James Redpath, Editor. Two dollars a year. Address, Boston, Mass.

ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

National Organ of the Garrisonian Abolitionists. Two dollars a year. No. 48 Beekman St., New York.

HERALD OF PROGRESS.

Devoted to the Harmonial Philosophy, and general Reform.—Andrew Jackson Davis, Editor. Two dollars a year. 274 Canal St., New York.

THE PRINCIPIA.

A religious Anti-Slavery journal. William Goodell, Editor. Two dollars a year. 104 William St., New York.

DOUGLASS' MONTHLY.

Frederick Douglass, Editor. One dollar a year. Rochester, N. Y.

THE CIRCULAR.

Organ of the Oneida Perfectionists.—One dollar a year, or free. Address, Circular, Oneida, N. Y.

THE SIBYL.

Devoted to Dress and other Reforms.—Dr. Lydia Sayer Hasbrouck, Editor. Fifty cents a year. Address, Middletown, Orange Co., N. Y.

THE PROGRESSIVE AGE.

Monthly. Fifty cents a year. Hopedale, Mass.

THE MAYFLOWER.

Devoted to the Interests of Woman.—Miss Lizzie Bunnell, Editor. Semi-Monthly. Fifty cents a year. Peru, Ind.

WESTERN OLIVE BRANCH.

Devoted to Temperance, Woman's Rights, and General Reform. Mrs. Carrie D. Filkins Bush, Editor. Monthly. Fifty cents a year. Address, Western Olive Branch, Indianapolis, Ind.

RISING TIDE.

Spiritualistic. Monthly. Seventy-five cents a year. Independence, Iowa.

THE BANNER OF LIGHT,
The Oldest and Largest Spiritualistic Journal
in the World.

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT BOSTON, MASS., BY

WILLIAM WHITE,
 LUTHER COLBY,

ISAAC B. RICH,
 CHARLES H. CROWELL.

LUTHER COLBY, EDITOR.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

Single copies, one year, - - - - -	\$2 00
Single copies, six months, - - - - -	1 00
Three copies, one year, in one package, per copy, - - -	1 75
Three copies, six months, in one package, per copy, - -	85
Four or more copies, one year, in one package, per copy, -	1 50
Four or more copies, six months, in one package, per copy, -	75

Every additional subscriber to a club will be charged \$1.50 per year.

There will be no deviation from the above terms.

Money sent at our risk; but where drafts on Boston can be procured, we prefer to have them sent, to avoid loss. No Western Bank Notes, excepting those of the State Bank of Ohio, State Bank of Iowa, and State Bank of Indiana, are current here; hence our Western subscribers, and others who have occasion to remit us funds, are requested to send bills on the above named Banks in case Eastern money can not be conveniently procured. Canadian bank notes are current here. Postage stamps—ones and threes only—of the new issue, will be received for subscriptions; subscribers will please send none of the other denominations, for they are of no use to us. Subscriptions discontinued at the expiration of the time paid for.

Subscribers in Canada, or other foreign countries, will add to the terms of subscription 52 cents per year, for prepayment of American postage.

Subscribers wishing the direction of their paper changed from one town to another, must always give the name of the Town, County and State to which it has been sent.

Specimen Copies sent free.

ADVERTISEMENTS inserted on the most favorable terms.

All Communications designed for publication, or in any connected with the editorial department, should be addressed to the EDITOR. Letters to the Editor not intended for publication should be marked "private" on the envelope.

CONTRIBUTORS.

Professor S. B. BRITTON, of New York City.
 HORACE DRESSER, LL.D., of New York.
 Hon. WARREN CHASE, of Battle Creek, Mich.
 HUDSON TUTTLE, Esq., of Berlin Heights, Ohio.
 GEORGE STEARNS, Esq., of West Acton, Mass.
 A. B. CHILD, M.D., of Boston.
 Rev. FRED. L. H. WILLIS, of Coldwater, Mich.
 Prof. PEYTON SPENCE, M.D., of New York City.
 URIAH CLARK, of Auburn, N. Y.
 W. W. H. McCURDY, of Ohio.
 Miss EMMA HARDINGE, of Boston.
 Miss CORA WILBURN, of Philadelphia, Pa.
 Mrs. A. M. SPENCE, of New York City.
 Miss A. W. SPRAGUE, of Plymouth, Vt.
 Miss BELLE BUSH, of Norristown, Pa.
 Mrs. EMMA TUTTLE, of Berlin Heights, Ohio.
 And many other writers of note.

IT PUBLISHES

Original Novellettes from the best pens in the country.

Original Essays upon philosophical, religious and scientific subjects.

Reports of Spiritual Lectures from trance normal speakers.

Spirit Messages, given through Mrs. J. H. Com from educated and uneducated spirits, proving their identity to relatives and friends.

Choice and Original Poetry, Miscellany, Wit, &c. All of which features render the BANNER a popular family paper, and at the same time the harbinger of a glorious scientific religion.

All Business Letters must be addressed

"BANNER OF LIGHT, BOSTON, MASS."

WILLIAM WHITE & CO.

A GENERAL PROSPECTUS

OF

THE BOSTON INVESTIGATOR.

VOLUME XXXII.

The cause of Universal Mental Liberty, which seeks to establish the claims and teachings of Nature and Reason, and to overthrow those of Superstition, Bigotry, and Priestcraft, still needs the support of free and independent press.

We have no new principles to proclaim, and hence we shall keep to the old landmarks by which we have so long been guided, endeavoring as far as we are able to render the paper acceptable to all, and subservient to national utility. Weaving superstition to be the bane of human improvement—the moral leprosy of mankind—our most especial object shall be, as it hitherto has been, to counteract its pernicious influence, and to expose, by every means in our power, the mischievous practice of that numerous class of pretenders who are perpetually directing the attention of their credulous followers to things above, that they may the more effectually deprive them of things below, and attempting to reconcile them to misery and degradation in this world by promising them happiness and honor in another.

Anti-religious, then, and anti-clerical, in connection with universal mental freedom, are the distinguishing characteristics of the INVESTIGATOR. But as our aim is the promotion of human happiness by means of mental cultivation, we shall enrich our columns with whatever we may deem conducive thereto. We shall therefore present to our readers whatever we may find valuable in literature, art, or science. As we pretend not to amuse the idle or soothe the ignorant, we shall have no pretty tales of mystery, to excite the imagination at the expense of the understanding; we shall, nevertheless, as much as possible, associate amusement with utility. In a word, we shall do the best we know how to render our paper deserving of the patronage we solicit, and worthy of the cause we advocate.

To the friends who have hitherto stood by us, and who have kindly tendered their further assistance, we return our most grateful acknowledgments; and we call upon every one of congenial thought and feeling to countenance and support us in our uncompromising hostility to religious imposture, which we consider the master-vice of the age.

The INVESTIGATOR being the only paper published in the known world which takes the broad ground of freely investigating all subjects, moral, social, and religious, we ask of those who are opposed to superstition, to religious cant and intolerance, to lend us their aid in extending its circulation.

TERMS—Two dollars per annum for a single copy; three dollars for two copies to one address. All letters should be directed to J. P. MENDUM,

No. 103 Court St., Boston, Mass.

SIBYL RIDGE
HYGIENIC RETREAT,
MIDDLETOWN, N. Y.

Many think they cannot visit Cures on account of the expense; this we obviate by placing our terms so low that this excuse must vanish. Then we shall allow patients that are able, to work to reduce their expenses by giving them such work as we have to do. In Winter it will be housework or sewing. In Summer we will have berries to pick, garden to plant and care for, and much other work that the season brings with it. This we believe will benefit the health as well as the purses of many, causing them to recover sooner than they otherwise would.

Friends of Reform, send your sick to us. We treat diseases of all kinds without drugs, and can cure all curable diseases and leave no poison in the system for future ailments. In addition to Baths of various descriptions, Electro-Magnetism, Exercises, the Spirometer and Blow Gun, are among the agents used by us in giving treatment. Send us your sick, that they may learn better ways of life, and be freed from suffering. Come to us from the East by the N. Y. & Erie R. R. We are only two hours, or 67 miles, from New York, and every train stops here. From the West the same road will bring you safely.

We are but a few minutes' walk from the depot, and while we enjoy all the advantages of a large and thriving village, we are out of its noise and dust, and our three-acre farm gives us space for exercise, and the cultivation of trees, fruits and flowers, most delicious in their season.

Our walls are adorned with choice Pictures in great variety, and we have also an extensive collection of Books in every department of literature. Besides, we are supplied daily with several leading city papers, together with numerous exchanges from various parts of the world. Our books and papers are free for the use of all.

Terms from \$5 to \$7, according to room and attention. Board without treatment, \$3 per week. Address L. SAYER HASBROUCK, M. D., Middletown, Orange Co., N. Y.

THE SIBYL, at Fifty Cents a year, is published monthly, at the same place. Devoted to Woman's Rights, Dress Reform, and other kindred Reforms.

S. S. BARRIE, Cleveland. D. P. BEDELL, New York.
S. S. BARRIE & CO.,

DEALERS IN

COAL OIL LAMPS, AND CARBON OIL,
No. 118 Bank St., --- Cleveland, Ohio.

Not to be undersold by any House in the United States.

YOUR ORDERS ARE SOLICITED.

MILO A. TOWNSEND,

DEALER IN

BOOKS, STATIONARY, WALL PAPER
Toys and Fancy Articles,
NEWBRIGHTON PA.

A CIRCULAR.

FRIENDS:—This is to call your attention to a small book, entitled,

"FREE LOVE;"

OR, A PHILOSOPHICAL DEMONSTRATION OF THE NON-EXCLUSIVE NATURE OF CONNUBIAL LOVE.

To which is added,

A Review of the Exclusive Phase in the Writings of the Fowlers, Adin Ballou, H. C. Wright, and A. J. Davis, on "Marriage."

The book was not written for children in age, in mentality, or in spirituality. It was designed for, and is adapted to, real men and real women—to thinkers, whether friends or opponents of its principles. It is offered by its author to all who believe in, and can endure, free inquiry; others are kindly cautioned not to waste their money in getting the book. It is a direct defense of Free Love, and a reply to four of the most able opponents of these principles. All who are interested in the late discussions on Marriage, whatever position they now occupy, should read it. These can hardly afford to do without it. It exactly meets the present want—the present state of the controversy, and grapples with the main and only really essential point in it. How effectually, the understanding reader should judge for himself. By "late discussions," are meant not only the works on the subject of the men referred to in the title, but also Noyes, James, Andrews, Lazarus, Nichols, and some others. Those who have read the Fowlers, Davis, Wright, or Ballou, are respectfully invited to get and read this Review.

Price, 50 cents in calf, 38 in paper, post paid. Postage stamps received.

To be had of the author,

AUSTIN KENT,

Hopkinton, St. Lawrence Co., N. Y.

The name and address of persons sending orders should be fully and plainly written.

The Fugitive Wife.

A NEW AND INTERESTING BOOK.

BY WARREN CHASE.

BELA MARSH has just published an interesting work, written by WARREN CHASE, author of "The Life Line of the Lone One," the title of which is "THE FUGITIVE WIFE;" being a Review, Criticism, and Commentary on Marriage, Adultery, and Divorce, Polygamy, Monogamy, Celibacy, and Free Love, Shakerism, Communism, and Socialism. Interspersed with Poems, Sketches of Actual Life, as seen by the author during many years travels, with proposed legal remedies for domestic troubles.

Price, in paper binding, 25 cents; in cloth, 40 cents,—sent by mail.

Published and for sale by

BELA MARSH,

14 Bromfield St., Boston.

And by the Author.

ARCANA OF NATURE.

BY HUDSON TUTTLE.

THIRD EDITION—JUST ISSUED!

Carefully Revised and Corrected by the Author.

CONTENTS.

PART I. Chapter I—A General Survey of Matter. Chapter II—The Origin of the Worlds. Chapter III—The Theory of the Origin of the Worlds. Chapter IV—History of the Earth, from the Gaseous Ocean to the Cambrian.

PART II. Chapter V—Life and Organization. Chapter VI—Plan of Organic Beings. Chapter VII—Influence of Conditions. Chapter VIII—Dawn of Life. Chapter IX—The History of Life through the Silurian Formation. Chapter X—The Old Red Sandstone Series. Chapter XI—Carboniferous or Coal Formation. Chapter XII—Permian and Trias Periods. Chapter XIII—Oolite; Lilas; Wealden. Chapter XIV—The Cretaceous or Chalk Period. Chapter XV—The Tertiary. Chapter XVI—Chapter of Inferences. Chapter XVII—Origin of Man.

PART III. Chapter XVIII—The Human Brain. Chapter XIX—Structure and Functions of the Brain and Nervous System, Studied with Reference to the Origin of Thought. Chapter XX—The Source of Thought Studied from a Philosophical Standpoint. Chapter XXI—Retrospect of the Theory of Development, as herein advanced; Conclusions; Facts followed from their Source to their Legitimate Results.

APPENDIX. An Explanation of some of the Laws of Nature, their Effects, &c.

Published by the Proprietors of the Banner of Light, No. 158 Washington Street, Boston, Mass. Sent to any part of the United States on receipt of One Dollar.

To the Diseased.

There are persons in all parts of the country who need medical advice and council in relation to their physical health, and the relation and influence of mind thereto. Those in Spirit life, in Mediumistic connection with those in earth life, (who, for years have made disease and its treatment a study) are prepared to impart such advice and direction through the undersigned.

Where the disease is described by the applicant the charge will be only fifty cents and two postage stamps. If written out from autograph or lock of hair, \$1 and two stamps.

A. UNDERHILL, M. D.

Cleveland, Ohio, April 24th, 1862.

P. O. Address to Box 2763.

NEW SERIES OF TRACTS

PUBLISHED BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

ARE TO BE OBTAINED AT THE

Anti-Slavery office, 48 Beekman street, New York; 166 North-Tenth street, Phila.; and 221, Washington street, Boston.

- No. 1. Correspondence between Lydia Maria Child and Governor Wise and Mrs. Mason, of Virginia. 5 cents.
- No. 2. Victor Hugo on American Slavery, with letters of other distinguished individuals, viz., De Taqueville, Mazzini, Humboldt, Lafayette, &c., 5 cents.
- No. 3. An Account of some of the Principle Slave Insurrections during the last two centuries. By Joshua Coffin. 5 cents.
- No. 4. The New Reign of Terror in the Slaveholding States, for 1859—'60. 10 cents.
- No. 5. Daniel O'Connell on American Slavery; with other Irish Testimonies. 5 cents.
- No. 6. The Right Way the Safe Way, proved by Emancipation in the West Indies, and elsewhere. By L. Maria Child. 10 cents.
- No. 7. Testimonies of Capt. John Brown, at Harper's Ferry, with his address to the Court. 2 cents.
- No. 8. The Philosophy of the Abolition Movement. By Wendell Phillips. 5 cents.
- No. 9. The Duty of Disobedience to the Fugitive Slave Act; An Appeal to the Legislature of Massachusetts. By L. Maria Child. 5 cents.
- No. 10. The Infidelity of Abolitionism. By Wm. Lloyd Garrison. 3 cents.
- No. 11. Speech of John Hossack convicted of violation of the Fugitive Slave Act, at Chicago, Illinois. 3 cents.
- No. 12. The Patriarchal Institution, as described by Members of its Own Family. Compiled by L. Maria Child. 5 cents.
- No. 13. No Slave-Hunting in the Old Bay State: An Appeal to the People and Legislature of Massachusetts. 5 cents.
- No. 14. A Fresh Catalogue of Southern Outrages upon Northern Citizens. 10 cents.
- No. 15. The Fugitive Slave Law and its Victims. By Rev. Samuel May, Jr. Revised and enlarged edition. 13 cents single, \$10 a hundred.
- No. 16. Tribute of William Ellery Channing to the American Abolitionists, for their Vindication of Freedom of Speech. 3 cents.
- No. 17. Argument of Wendell Phillips Against the Repeal of the Personal Liberty Law, before the Committee of the Legislature, Jan. 29, 1861. 5 cents.
- No. 18. A Voice from Harper's Ferry. A Narrative of Events at Harper's Ferry; with incidents prior and subsequent to its capture by Captain John Brown and his men. By Osborne P. Anderson, one of the number. 15 cents.
- No. 19. The Abolition of Slavery the Right of the Government under the War Power. 5 cents.
- No. 20. The Loyalty and Devotion of Colored Americans in the Revolution and War of 1812. 5 cents.
- No. 21. In Memoriam. Testimonials to the Life and Character of the late Francis Jackson. 5 cents.

A deduction of fifty per cent. will be made where a dozen or more copies are taken. Gratuitous copies will be sent by mail, for examination, on receiving the postage charge.